UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA STEVEN H. KASSEL, Plaintiff, No. C-06-03273 SC v. ORDER DENYING MOTION TO STAY ENFORCEMENT UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, OF JUDGMENT PENDING APPEAL Defendant. I. INTRODUCTION

On April 30, 2007, following a three day trial, the Court entered judgment against Plaintiff Steven H. Kassel ("Kassel") and in favor of Defendant, the United States of America ("Government"), in the amount of \$25,568.68 plus costs. See Docket No. 44. On the Government's motion, the Court subsequently amended the judgment to include post-judgment interest, which began to accrue on April 30, 2007. See Docket No. 48.

Kassel has appealed both the original Judgment and the Order Granting Defendant's Motion to Alter Judgment. See Docket No. 51. Now before the Court is Kassel's Motion to Stay Enforcement of Judgment Pending Appeal. See Docket No. 52. The Government opposed Kassel's motion. See Docket No. 55. For the reasons set forth herein, the Court DENIES Kassel's motion to stay judgment

pending appeal.

II. <u>DISCUSSION</u>

Kassel seeks a stay of judgment pending appeal, but he has neither posted a bond nor shown any basis for staying the judgment absent a bond.

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 62(d), an appellant may obtain a stay of judgment by posting a supersedeas bond at or after the time of filing the notice of appeal. Fed. R. Civ. P. 62(d). Posting the bond allows a stay as a matter of right. See id. Although the text of Rule 62(d) only refers to bonds, courts have interpreted the rule with some flexibility, allowing other forms of security as may be appropriate for a given case. See, e.g., Townsend v. Holman Consulting Corp., 929 F.2d 1358, 1367 (9th Cir. 1991) (en banc); Int'l Telemeter Corp. v. Hamlin Int'l Corp., 754 F.2d 1492, 1495 (9th Cir. 1985). "The posting of a bond protects the prevailing plaintiff from the risk of a later uncollectible judgment and compensates him for delay in the entry of the final judgment." N.L.R.B. v. Westphal, 859 F.2d 818, 819 (9th Cir. 1988).

Kassel has not posted a bond or any other security which would protect the Government from future nonpayment. The Court may, at its discretion, grant a stay in the absence of a bond, after considering a number of factors, including:

⁽¹⁾ the complexity of the collection process;

⁽²⁾ the amount of time required to obtain a judgment after it is affirmed on appeal; (3) the degree of confidence that the district court has in the availability of funds to pay

the judgment; (4) whether the defendant's ability to pay the judgment is so plain that the cost of a bond would be a waste of money; and (5) whether the defendant is in such a precarious financial situation that the requirement to post a bond would place other creditors of the defendant in an insecure position.

<u>Dillon v. City of Chicago</u>, 866 F.2d 902, 904-05 (7th Cir. 1988) (internal citations omitted). Kassel has not provided the Court with information on any of these factors.

The only discernible basis Kassel suggests for granting the stay is that the harm to the Government would be "inconsequential." Mot. at 2. Kassel offers no support for this assertion, however. The Government is entitled to prompt payment of the penalty it levied against Kassel in 2005. During the time Kassel's appeal is pending, interest will continue to accrue, as will Kassel's legal bills. It would be unfair to make the Government carry the risk of Kassel becoming unable to pay while the appeal is pending. It is this exact risk that Rule 62(d) is intended to prevent a prevailing party from shouldering.

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court finds that there is no justification for a stay pending appeal in this matter. The Court therefore DENIES Kassel's motion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 19, 2007



Case 3:06-cv-03273-SC Document 57 Filed 09/19/07 Page 4 of 4

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE